

identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy

U.S. Department of Homeland Security
U. S. Citizenship and Immigration Services
Office of Administrative Appeals MS 2090
Washington, DC 20529-2090



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

PUBLIC COPY

B5

FILE:

SRC 07 800 24588

Office: NEBRASKA SERVICE CENTER

Date: **MAR 10 2010**

IN RE:

Petitioner:
Beneficiary:

PETITION: Immigrant Petition for Alien Worker as a Member of the Professions Holding an Advanced Degree or an Alien of Exceptional Ability Pursuant to Section 203(b)(2) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(2)

ON BEHALF OF PETITIONER:

SELF REPRESENTED

INSTRUCTIONS:

This is the decision of the Administrative Appeals Office in your case. All documents have been returned to the office that originally decided your case. Any further inquiry must be made to that office.

If you believe the law was inappropriately applied or you have additional information that you wish to have considered, you may file a motion to reconsider or a motion to reopen. Please refer to 8 C.F.R. § 103.5 for the specific requirements. All motions must be submitted to the office that originally decided your case by filing a Form I-290B, Notice of Appeal or Motion, with a fee of \$585. Any motion must be filed within 30 days of the decision that the motion seeks to reconsider or reopen, as required by 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(1)(i).

Perry Rhew
Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The Director, Nebraska Service Center, denied the immigrant visa petition. The matter is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be rejected as untimely filed pursuant to 8 C.F.R. § 103.3(a)(2)(v)(B)(1).

The petitioner claims to be a software consulting and development business. It seeks to permanently employ the beneficiary as a programmer analyst. The petitioner requests classification of the beneficiary as an advanced degree professional pursuant to section 203(b)(2) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(2).¹ The petition is accompanied by an ETA Form 9089, Application for Permanent Employment Certification, certified by the U.S. Department of Labor.

In order to properly file an appeal, the regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 103.3(a)(2)(i) provides that the affected party must file the complete appeal within 30 days after service of the unfavorable decision. If the decision was mailed, the appeal must be filed within 33 days. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 103.5a(b). The date of filing is not the date of mailing, but the date of actual receipt. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 103.2(a)(7)(i).

The director denied the petition on September 29, 2008. The decision states that the petitioner failed to establish that the beneficiary possessed the experience required for classification in the requested immigrant visa preference category. The decision properly gave notice to the petitioner that it had 33 days to file an appeal. The petitioner filed a motion to reopen and reconsider the decision on October 28, 2008. The director dismissed the motion on November 14, 2008. Again, the director properly gave notice to the petitioner that it had 33 days to file an appeal. The instant appeal was received by the director on January 13, 2009, 77 days after the director issued the decision dismissing the motion. Accordingly, the appeal was untimely filed.

Neither the Act nor the pertinent regulations grant the AAO authority to extend the 33-day time limit for filing an appeal. However, the regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 103.3(a)(2)(v)(B)(2) states that, if an untimely appeal meets the requirements of a motion to reopen or a motion to reconsider, the appeal must be treated as a motion, and a decision must be made on the merits of the case.

A motion to reopen must state the new facts to be proved in the reopened proceeding and be supported by affidavits or other documentary evidence. 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(2). A motion to reconsider must state the reasons for reconsideration and be supported by any pertinent precedent decisions to establish that the decision was based on an incorrect application of law or U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services policy. A motion to reconsider a decision on an application or

¹Section 203(b)(2) of the Act provides immigrant classification to members of the professions holding advanced degrees or aliens of exceptional ability, whose services are sought by an employer in the United States. There is no evidence in the record of proceeding that the beneficiary possesses exceptional ability in the sciences, arts or business. Accordingly, consideration of the petition will be limited to whether the beneficiary is eligible for classification as a member of the professions holding an advanced degree.

petition must, when filed, also establish that the decision was incorrect based on the evidence of record at the time of the initial decision. 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(3).

It is noted that, on June 4, 2008, the director issued a Request for Evidence (RFE). The RFE instructed the petitioner to submit evidence of the beneficiary's qualifying employment experience. In denying the petition, the director concluded that the documents submitted in response to the RFE were not sufficient to establish that the beneficiary possessed the required experience. On appeal, the petitioner submitted additional evidence of the beneficiary's employment experience. These documents were previously requested by the director in the RFE.² Therefore, following a review of the procedural history of the case and the evidence submitted on appeal, it is concluded that the untimely appeal does not meet the requirements of a motion to reconsider or reopen. A motion that does not meet applicable requirements shall be dismissed. 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(4).

The untimely appeal does not meet the requirements of a motion to reopen or a motion to reconsider. Therefore, there is no requirement to treat the appeal as a motion under 8 C.F.R. § 103.3(a)(2)(v)(B)(2).³

As the appeal was untimely filed and does not qualify as a motion, the appeal must be rejected.

ORDER: The appeal is rejected.

²The purpose of the RFE is to elicit further information that clarifies whether eligibility for the benefit sought has been established, as of the time the petition is filed. *See* 8 C.F.R. §§ 103.2(b)(8) and (12). The failure to submit requested evidence that precludes a material line of inquiry shall be grounds for denying the petition. 8 C.F.R. § 103.2(b)(14). As in the present matter, where a petitioner has been put on notice of a deficiency in the evidence and has been given an opportunity to respond to that deficiency, the AAO will not accept evidence offered for the first time on appeal. *See Matter of Soriano*, 19 I&N Dec. 764 (BIA 1988); *Matter of Obaigbena*, 19 I&N Dec. 533 (BIA 1988). If the petitioner had wanted the submitted evidence to be considered, it should have submitted the documents in response to the director's request for evidence. *Id.* Under the circumstances, the AAO need not, and does not, consider the sufficiency of the evidence submitted on appeal. Therefore, even if the instant appeal was timely filed, it would have been dismissed for this reason.

³During the adjudication of the appeal, evidence has come to light that the petitioner's corporate status with the State of California has been forfeited. *See* State of California Secretary of State Business Entity website, <http://kepler.sos.ca.gov/cbs.aspx> (accessed February 18, 2010). If the petitioner is no longer an active business, the petition and its appeal are moot. Where there is no active business, no legitimate job offer exists, and the request that a foreign worker be allowed to fill the position listed in the petition has become moot. Therefore, if the appeal were not being rejected for the reason set forth above, this would call into question the petitioner's eligibility for the benefit sought.